

I oppose loosening the rules designed to promote and protect diversity of media ownership. These rules were adopted to ensure that the public would receive a diverse range of viewpoints from the media, and not simply the opinions of a handful of media conglomerates.

The proposal to loosen the rules seem to be a benefit only to the media companies that already have strong control of their respective media outlets, i.e. newspaper, TV, etc.

These media companies fall short of providing information that comes from varied sources and therefore are lacking in offering a range of truly diverse opinions or outlooks. Allowing a reduction in the number of sources will not improve this situation. None of the media companies are particularly oriented towards minorities or even opposition opinions to mainstream issues, instead they seem to value commercial and/or superficial ideas and/or topics. When dealing with major topics, they usually offer little in-depth coverage

Furthermore, these companies aren't controlled or managed by a minority, so I doubt that they would be likely to change their viewpoints or orientation to address issues important to people beyond the companies' usual topics.

Television is a very important outlet that a lot of people pay attention to, since not everyone can afford a computer or knows how to use one. I don't believe that this lack of diversification of viewpoints or opinion or programs, has been helped by the number of cable television channels either, except in one way. The exception I speak of is the local TV news station that some areas might have. Public access also does offer some variety, but not on a scale to match the large media companies. Another thing, not everyone can afford to buy cable or satellite TV.

These are some of the reasons I believe that it is very important to keep strict the rules that govern ownership of media. Loosening them will not help or benefit the public.